



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,431	09/13/2000	Newton James Smith JR.	AUS9000386US1	9056

35617 7590 07/01/2005

DAFFER MCDANEIL LLP  
P.O. BOX 684908  
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER
----------

PHAM, TUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/662,431

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

TUAN A. PHAM

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-16, and 21-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's remark, filed on 04/14/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-22 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is further made in view of Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,298,128).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, and 3-8, and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,940, hereinafter "Shaffer") in view of Sarkissian et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0001301, hereinafter, "Sarkissian") and further in view of Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,298,128, hereinafter "Ramey").

Regarding claim 1, Shaffer teaches an electronic communication device (see figure 1, telephone 70) comprising:

a processor (i.e., processing unit) (see figure 1, telephone 70, col.3, ln.10-15),  
and

a storage medium (see figure 1, speed dial memory 74) comprising program instruction executable by the processor for receiving an electronic notification of a change to a directory entry stored within the electronic communication device (see col.3, ln.10-24), wherein the electronic notification is included an identifier (i.e., signaling message is included the ID and telephone number) and an altered value (i.e., telephone number or address)(see col.2, ln.19-24).

It should be noticed that Shaffer fails to clearly teach the electronic notification is included a category (i.e., financial report or information reports, etc.), presenting the electronic notification to a user of the electronic communications devices, and automatically updating the directory entry to include the altered value upon receipt of an acceptance command generated by the user. However, Sarkissian teaches such features (see col.8, [0092-0094]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sarkissian, into view of Shaffer in order to not frustrated to copy down the error message correctly as suggested by Shaffer at column 2, lines 43-50.

Shafer and Sarkissian, in combination, fails to teach comparing the identifier of the electronic message to entry identifiers corresponding to a plurality of directory entries stored within the electronic communication device, comparing the category heading of the electronic message to field headings corresponding to the plurality of directory entries, upon matching the identifier of the electronic messages to an entry identifier associated with the directory entry, and replace one or more entry content values corresponding to the directory entry with the altered value, upon matching the category heading of the electronic message to one or more field heading associated with the directory entry. However, Ramey teaches comparing the identifier (see figure 2, ID number) of the electronic message to entry identifiers corresponding to a plurality of directory entries stored within the electronic communication device, comparing the category heading (read on caller ID group, E-Mail group) of the electronic message to field headings (read on number filed, name field) corresponding to the plurality of directory entries, upon matching the identifier of the electronic messages to an entry identifier associated with the directory entry, and replace one or more entry content values corresponding to the directory entry with the altered value, upon matching the category heading of the electronic message to one or more field heading associated with the directory entry (see figure 2, col.5, ln.23-67, col.6, ln.1-67, col.7, ln.1-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ramey, into view of Shaffer and Sarkissian in order to automatically update the telephone directory and easily reply to an incoming message as suggested by Ramey at column 3, lines 10-45.

**Regarding claim 3**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the altered value comprises a name, a telephone number, a mailing address or an email address (see col.3, ln.1-9).

**Regarding claim 4**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device comprises a telephone (see figure 1, telephone 50, see col.2, ln.1-2).

**Regarding claim 5**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communication device comprises a facsimile machine (see figure 2, fax 100).

**Regarding claim 6**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the electronic communications device comprises a personal digital assistant. It is obvious that the PDA devices it is well known to include a telephone directory (see col.1, ln.10-15).

**Regarding claim 7**, Ramey further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the electronic communications device comprises: a storage medium comprising a data structure wherein the data structure comprises fields adapted for storage of entry content values and an entry identifier associated with each of the plurality of directory entries, and wherein the category heading is associated with the electronic notification corresponds to one or more headings of the fields (see figure 2, col.5, ln.23-67, col.6, ln.1-67, col.7, ln.1-46).

**Regarding claim 8**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the entry content values comprise a name, a telephone number, a mailing address or an email address (see col.3, ln.1-9).

**Regarding claim 10**, Sarkissian further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the directory management program further comprises program instructions executable by the processor for presenting permission prompt to the user of the electronic communications device (see col.8, [0093]).

**Regarding claim 11**, Sarkissian further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the presenting comprises displaying on an output mechanism of the electronic communications device (see col.8, [0093]).

**Regarding claim 12**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the presenting comprises providing audible output (see col.3, ln.30-37).

**Regarding claim 13**, Sarkissian further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the directory management program further comprises program instructions executable by the processor for receiving a confirmation indicator to accept the received electronic notification (see col.8, [0093]).

**Regarding claim 14**, Sarkissian further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the directory management program further comprises program instructions executable by the processor for receiving a reject command to reject the received electronic notification (see col.8, [0093]).

**Regarding claim 15**, Shaffer further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the receiving comprises receiving a vocal input (see figure 1, telephone 50).

**Regarding claim 16**, Sarkissian further teaches the electronic communications device wherein the receiving comprises receiving a dual tone multi-frequency (DTMF) tone (see col.4, [0064]).

**4. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,940, hereinafter "Shaffer") in view of Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,298,128, hereinafter "Ramey").**

**Regarding claims 21-22**, Shaffer teaches a method and storage medium for updating of a directory entry within an electronic communications device upon receipt of an electronic notification, (see figure 1, col.2, ln.20-37) the method comprising:

receiving the electronic notification indicating that at least a portion of the directory entry has changed to an altered value (see figure 1, col.2, ln.20-50),

It should be noticed that Shaffer fails to teach searching entirety of directory entries to match an identifier of the electronic notification with a matching entry identifier associated with the directory entry; matching a field heading associated with the data structure of the directory entry with a category heading of said electronic notification; and updating one or more entry content values with the altered value, wherein said entry content values correspond to a field associated with the matching entry identifier



Art Unit: 2643

and field heading of the directory entry. However, Ramey teaches such features (see figure 2, col.3, ln.10-40, col.5, ln.23-67, col.6, ln.1-67, col.7, ln.1-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ramey, into view of Shaffer in order to automatically update the telephone directory and easily reply to an incoming message as suggested by Ramey at column 3, lines 10-45.

Art Unit: 2643

### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tuan A. Pham** whose telephone number is (571) 272-8097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM-5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and

**IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL Customer Service at (571) 272-2600 FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have question on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2643  
June 24, 2005  
Examiner

Tuan Pham

  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER